

specific identifier, or (2) performing a second mathematical computation using a second user-dependent access identifier and the user-independent client-communication-system-specific identifier received from the client communication system.

Independent Claim 1 and Dependent Claims 2-6, 8-12, and 16-18

Okada is directed to a system for distributing software and managing identifiers indicating information about destinations to which software is distributed. *See* Okada, lines 7-12, column 1. In distributing software, Okada discloses a process where a host computer “checks the user identifier UID and the user password PSW” and then, if proceeding, “reads and checks the terminal identifier MID and the terminal password MPSW stored in the terminal automatically.” *See* Okada, lines 17-28, column 9. Okada describes that the terminal password is obtained by predetermined computations using terminal-specific information. *See* Okada, lines 39-47, column 11.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection as a consequence of Okada not describing or suggesting the first and second mathematical computations as claimed. As detailed by the claim language itself, the first and second mathematical computations are different computations performed at different entities. Notably, the Office Action cites a single description of obtaining a terminal password in Okada as disclosing both of the different first and second mathematical computations. *See* Office Action, pages 2 and 3.

Moreover, while the Office Action may read Okada as disclosing a user-independent client communication-system-specific identifier and a user-dependent client communication-system-specific identifier, Okada does not describe or suggest the claimed method of using such identifiers within first and second mathematical computations, as claimed. The distinctions between how the first and second mathematical computations are used is not trivial as the method differently calculates the first and second mathematical computations so as to achieve a determination of whether a client communication system seeking access to a host communication system is authorized to do so. The below remarks specify with greater detail how the claimed method differs from the methods taught by Okada.

First, referring to the portion of the claim including the first mathematical computation, the claim recites that the host receives (from the client communication system) a user-

independent client communication-system-specific identifier and results of a first mathematical computation performed at the client on a first user-dependent access identifier and the user-independent client-communication-system-specific identifier. Notably, as claimed, the user-independent client communication-system-specific identifier is both received at the host from the client and is part of the first mathematical computation which is performed at the client and received at the host. In rejecting this claim portion, the Office Action referred to Okada's disclosure of a terminal identifier, user password, and predetermined computations. *See* Office Action, page 3. This disclosure does not describe or suggest the claim portion above as nowhere does Okada describe or suggest that the terminal identifier is used in performing the first mathematical computation at the client as well as sent from the client to the host as indicated by the claimed method. Instead, Okada describes that the host computer issues a terminal identifier to a user terminal which stores the issued terminal identifier. *See* Okada at column 8, line 66 to column 9, line 12. Further, no other identifier described or suggested by Okada is used in performing the first mathematical computation at the client as well as sent from the client to the host. This dual use of the user-independent client-communication-system-specific identifier is important, as it enables the host to calculate the second mathematical computation (as described below) and to compare the first and second mathematical computations.

Second, referring to the claim portion including the second mathematical computation, the claim recites that the second mathematical computation is performed using an accessed (at the host) second user-dependent access identifier and the user-independent client communication-system-specific identifier received (at the host) from the client communication system. Therefore, as claimed, the second mathematical computation includes use of the user-independent client communication-system-specific identifier received at the host (as discussed above with respect to the first mathematical computation), and includes use of a second user-dependent access identifier accessed at the host. In rejecting this claim portion, the Office Action referred to Okada's disclosure of a terminal identifier, user password, and predetermined computations (the same disclosure as relied on to reject the different first mathematical computation). This disclosure does not describe or suggest the second mathematical computation as nowhere does Okada describe or suggest that the terminal identifier is both received at host from the client and used in performing the second mathematical computation as

claimed. In contrast to receiving a user-dependent access identifier at a host and then using the identifier to perform the claimed second mathematical computation, the host terminal of Okada itself issues the terminal identifier to the user terminal. *See* Okada at column 8, line 66 to column 9, line 12.

Independent Claims 32 and 63 and Dependent Claims 33-43, 47-49, 64-68, 70-74, and 78

Independent claim 32 recites a computer readable medium or propagated signal having embodied thereon a computer program for identifying an unauthorized client communication system seeking access to a host communication system in a manner corresponding to that of independent claim 1, and independent claim 63 recites an apparatus that does the same.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons noted above with respect to independent claim 1, applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 32 and 63, along with claims 33-43, 47-49, 64-68, 70-74, and 78 that depend therefrom.

Independent Claims 19, 50, and 79 and Dependent Claims 33-43, 47-49, 64-68, 70-74, and 78

Each of independent claims 19, 50, and 79 recite include limitations that leverage a user-independent client-communication-system-specific identifier and results of a first mathematical computation performed, at a client communication system, on a user-dependent access identifier and the user-independent client-communication-system-specific identifier, and the second mathematical computation using the stored version of the user-dependent access identifier and the user-independent client-communication-system-specific identifier received from the client communication system.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons noted above with respect to independent claim 1, applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 19, 50 and 79, along with claims 20, 22-25, 27-31, 51, 53-56, 58-62, 80, 83-86, and 88-92 that depend therefrom.

Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims)

that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim except as specifically stated in this reply.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 1, 2007

/Gabriel Olander/
Gabriel D. Olander
Reg. No. 59,185

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331